

Remarks

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are pending.

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 were rejected.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claim to refer to a ‘first telephone protocol,’ a ‘second protocol,’ and a ‘third telephone protocol.’ Applicants submit that these amendments overcome the objection to the claims and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 1-9 11-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter et al. (US Patent No. 6,789,077), in view of Jagannathan et al (US Patent No. 6,496,871).

Slaughter is directed to a document browsing system and Jagannathan is directed to a distributed software system for management of objects. The invention as claimed is directed to a communications system for telephones. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 13, 16 and 17 to more clearly point this out. Nothing in the combination of references addresses the system as claimed with incoming telephone calls that are transferred to other spaces as object to complete the phone call.

Further, in arguments directed to claim 16, the office action states that Slaughter teaches receiving a telephone call. However, the text referred to in Slaughter is actually directed to using a WAP browser on a cell phone, not placing a telephone call from a calling to a called user. The claims have been amended to more clearly state that the system receives and transfers telephone calls. See for example, claim 1, including *at least one double agent, operable to communicate with entities making and receiving telephone calls using a second protocol and the persistent store using the first protocol, and transferring the objects to the persistent store in another*

community wherein the objects intended for the persistent store in another community are telephone calls intended for users that are members of the other community. Neither reference nor the combination thereof teaches such a system.

Further, the office action refers to col. 39, lines 11-39 of Slaughter to teach the community service required in the claims. However, Slaughter merely refers to leasing connections and using a separate space to hold the results of the user searches. This is not the same as *a community service to manage the communication system, wherein managing the communications system includes registering distributed, persistent stores, agents and services and the community service monitors, stops, re-starts, and clones stores, agents and services without requiring administrative intervention*, as is now required by the independent claims.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter in view of Jagannathan and further in view of Bahlmann (US Patent No. 6,487,594).

The combination of Slaughter and Jagannathan does not teach all of the limitations of base claim 13, from which claim 14 depends. Bahlmann does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L Reed

Julie L. Reed

Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613